1-2017

Strategic Person and Organization Development: Implications of Imago Dei for Contemporary Human Resource Management

Richard H. Jonsen
Rowan University, jonsen@rowan.edu

Recommended Citation

Richard H. Jonsen. "Strategic Person and Organization Development: Implications of Imago Dei for Contemporary Human Resource Management" The Journal of Biblical Integration in Business Vol. 20 Iss. 1 (2017) p. 8 - 23.

Strategic Person and Organization Development: Implications of *Imago Dei* for Contemporary Human Resource Management

Richard Harvey Jonsen
Eastern University

ABSTRACT: This paper examines and compares the foundational assumptions of contemporary scholarship and practice on strategic human resource management to those embedded in emerging Christian faith-based approaches to business. An alternative ecumenical, biblically based set of assumptions for a Christian approach to strategic human resource management — or strategic person and organization development — is developed, along with corresponding set principles for future scholarship and practice.

KEYWORDS: Strategic human resources management, business for the common good, theological turn, workplace community, human capital, neoclassical economics

INTRODUCTION

A recent edition of *Harvard Business Review* (*HBR*) dedicated to discussing the merits and value of the human resources function in contemporary organizations called for a vision and implementation of human resource practice in which people and organizational concerns are integral to company strategy and execution. A theme across these *HBR* articles is the need for human resource professionals to have deep knowledge of the business, look toward the future, and embrace big-picture thinking (Boudreau & Rice, 2015; Cappelli, 2015). This theme includes a thread quietly acknowledging the need for HR executives and their organizations to have a solid foundation of values or principles from which to operate, clearly and tightly connected to delivering improved results in the marketplace. This thread can be tied to earlier work calling for a rethinking of management practice (Ghoshal, 2005) that includes drawing upon cross-disciplinary sources such as theology (Hamel, 2009). In addition to this call for a general re-assessment of management theory, Delbecq (2009) and Neal (2013) have called for a more penetrating exploration of how spirituality and religion can inform specific management practices, many of which are typically identified as HR practices[1]. Dyck and Wiebe (2012) have labeled this movement the "theological turn" in management and organization studies.

Christian management and organization scholars from Protestant and Roman Catholic traditions are among those participating in this theological turn. These scholars have published management survey texts targeted for undergraduate business courses (e.g., Cafferky, 2012; Dyck & Neubert, 2010)[2], articles and books characterizing a Christian approach to business and management (e.g., Alford & Naughton, 2001; Carrascoso, 2014; Dyck, 2013; Sison & Fontrodona, 2012; Van Duzer, Franz, Karns, Wong, & Daniels, 2007; Van Duzer, 2010; Wong & Rae, 2011), at least two books specifically addressing human resources management (Nyambegera, 2005; Roberts, 2015), and numerous related articles in academic journals. This paper draws upon these resources and others to join the theological turn, adding to current scholarship by (a) focusing specifically on strategic human resource management as a general management responsibility integrating the organization's people and competitive advantage interests, as opposed to a staff function; (b) critically examining the foundational assumptions of contemporary strategic human resource management; (c) developing an alternative, ecumenical, biblically based set of assumptions upon which to base a Christian approach to strategic human resource management; and (d) proposing a set of principles for a Christian approach to strategic human resource management based on those assumptions.

My examination begins by tracing the roots of strategic human resource management theory and practice, identifying its embedded assumptions about humanity and the purpose of business. I then examine seven Christian approaches to business for guidance on alternative assumptions and principles upon which to base strategic human resource management. Based on this examination, I propose a framework for a faith-based approach to strategic human resource management then conclude with related observations and discussion, considering implications for future research.

STRATEGIC HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT AND HUMAN CAPITAL

Strategic human resources management (SHRM) is concerned with aligning organizational human resource management (HRM) practices and outcomes with the organization's strategies and outcomes, particularly in regards to achieving sustainable competitive advantage (Barney & Clark, 2007; Boxall & Purcell, 2011; Tichy, Fombrun, & Devanna, 1984; Wright, McMahan, & McWilliams, 1994). SHRM research and practice approaches HRM as a responsibility of general management rather than a staff function, addressing the responsibilities, accountabilities and activities of leaders and managers throughout the organization, not simply the human resources department, if the company has one.[3]

Fombrun, Tichy and Devanna (1984) and Beer, Spector, Lawrence, Mills and Walton (1984) are among the earliest advocates of a transition to a general management view of HRM, or SHRM. Fombrun (1984) traces HRM in the United States back to its origins as a staff function in the early twentieth century. The original focus of HR activities and departments[4] was on cost reduction. Fombrun et al. (1984) note a transition to a more managerial HR (or "personnel") role in the 1960s focused on accountability and compliance to new government agencies and associated regulations (e.g., the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Civil Rights Act of 1964, Employment Retirement Income Security Act, Occupational Safety and Health Act). Decreasing global competitiveness of American companies in the 1980s prompted Fombrun (1984) and Beer et al. (1984) to advocate that organizations shift their view of HRM from a managerial/operational/transactional perspective to a strategic perspective that aligns the organization's people management systems and practices with strategic concerns such as improving innovation, productivity and competitiveness. Tichy, Fombrun, and Devanna (1984) go on to specifically link HRM to enterprise-wide strategic planning, and then outline a SHRM framework that "align[s] the formal structure and the human resource systems so that they drive the strategic objectives of the organization" (Devanna, Fombrun, & Tichy, 1984, p. 37). Beer et al. (1984) identify these strategic objectives as including employee, enterprise, and societal stakeholder interests.

Devanna, et al. (1984) observed that an organization's HR systems reveal its underlying assumptions about people. Jackson, Schuler, Lepak and Tarique (2012) capture the underlying assumptions about people embedded in contemporary SHRM in their characterization of human resources professionals as "human capital asset experts whose efforts are aimed at creating competitive advantages for the firm" (p. 451). Jackson et al. echo the Academy of Management's Human Resources Division (AOMHRD) domain statement that identifies the division as being "dedicated to a better understanding of how work organizations can perform more effectively by better management of their human resources" (Human Resources Division, Academy of Management, 2014). Both Jackson et al. (2012) and the AOMHRD statements allude to SHRM's roots in the resource-based view of the firm (Boxall & Purcell, 2011), the concept of human capital (Barney, 1991; Flamholz & Lacey, 1981), and the neoclassical view of humanity as utility maximizers (Becker, 1964; Becker, 1976). The next section examines how these concepts became central to SHRM thinking and the assumptions that proceed from them.

The Resource-Based View of the Firm

Models of business strategy — gaining and sustaining competitive advantage — were being critically re-examined during the final decades of the twentieth century. Porter's (1979; 1980) arguments regarding competitive forces and generic strategies are perhaps the most enduring of the work that focused on a firm's external environment. Approaches to strategy focusing on the firm's internal environment were also being considered, the most enduring of which is the resource-based view (RBV) of the firm.

The RBV finds it roots primarily in the work of Edith Penrose (1959). Penrose saw the industrial firm as a collection of productive resources woven together in a management framework. Productive resources include physical resources (plant, equipment, natural resources, raw materials, etc.) and human resources (employees at

all levels) available to the organization. Penrose's view of a firm's physical and human resources was fundamentally instrumental, meaning all resources were valued based on the productive service they could provide toward the end of long-term profit generation. At the same time, she saw the retention and investment in human resources development as a competitive advantage that expanded a firm's opportunities for growth through innovation and/or merger/acquisition (Penrose, 1959). It is tempting to read into Penrose's work a moral position on the value of people beyond the utility of their productive service.[5] At no point in her writings, however, does Penrose recognize the value of people inside the firm beyond their utility as a productive resource to further the long-term profitability of the firm.

Wernerfelt (1984) expanded on Penrose's work, bringing the RBV into the emerging strategy discussion. The RBV provided an internal resources perspective on organizational strategy that complemented Porter's (1979; 1980) external perspective. It was Barney's (1991) characterization of the four indicators of resource competitive advantage, however, that built the RBV's following as a viable model for business strategy. Barney's RBV identified three types of firm resources: physical, human, and organizational capital. Physical capital resembled Penrose's definition of physical resources. Barney's human capital includes "the training, experience, judgment, intelligence, relationships, and insight of *individual* managers and workers in a firm" (Barney, 1991, p. 101, emphasis in original). Organizational capital includes the company's organization design; formal and informal systems for planning, controlling, and coordinating; and informal relationships within the organization and between the organization and its external environment. Barney argued that these resources will contribute to the organization's sustained competitive advantage in the marketplace to the extent that they are (a) valuable, (b) rare, (c) imperfectly imitable, and (d) not substitutable. Barney (1995) later modified his four-point measure of internal resources, integrating substitutes into imitability, and adding the organization's ability to utilize its resources as the fourth and final measure. These four measures (valuable, rare, inimitable, and organization) form Barney's (2007) VRIO framework for resource-based analysis of an organization's competitive position and strategy.

SHRM, the RBV, and Human Capital

Barney's (1991) triad of resources (physical, human, and organizational capital) linked to a firm's sustainable competitive advantage and his VRIO model fit well with emerging SHRM thought, discussion, and research in the late twentieth century. Discussing SHRM in the context of the HR function, Barney and Wright (1998) argue that the VRIO framework provides human resources executives with the tools to transform the HR function from being a cost center or expense into a value creator by "developing employees who are skilled and motivated to deliver high quality products and services, managing the culture of the organization to encourage teamwork and trust… and developing coherent systems of HR practices that support these aims" (Barney & Wright, 1998, p. 44). Barney's RBV has since become one of the most common models used in SHRM research (Boxall & Purcell, 2011).

The implicit assumptions regarding humanity embedded in Barney's (1991) RBV find their roots in Becker (1964). Becker's *Human Capital* introduces a new type of capital that, like all other forms of capital, can "yield income and other useful outputs over long periods of time" (Becker, 1964, p. 15). Becker's analysis is conducted at the societal level, arguing that investments in schooling, training, medical care, and Franklin-like virtues of punctuality and honesty, will yield higher income and improved quality of life for both individuals and society as a whole. His view of human behavior is rooted firmly in a neoclassical (McCormick, 1997) economic view of humanity in which all human behavior is based on people making rational choices aimed at maximizing their own personal utility (Becker, 1976). Thus, through integrating the RBV into SHRM, SHRM has adopted the neoclassical view of humanity.

This instrumental, self-focused, utility maximizing perspective of humanity in SHRM has other sources as well, including Flamholtz and Lacey's (1981) framework for making personnel (or HR) investment decisions based on human capital theory. They understood human capital theory as an assumption that states expenditures in employee training, education, and orientation will increase worker productive capacity and thereby be an investment that produces future returns for the organization. This is consistent with Becker's (1964) societal-level conception, though applied at the organizational level. Flamholtz and Lacey's (1981) focus was more explicitly utilitarian than Becker (1964; 1976) or Barney (1991; 1995) as their human resource accounting model measured and reported "the cost and value of people as organizational resources" (p. 57), with a goal of maximizing the utility of human capital investment on the part of the firm. Individual self-actualization for each employee was

important in Flamholtz and Lacey's model to the extent that it ensured maximum utility — or benefit — for both the employee and the organization, founded in a belief that employees only achieve their full potential in service to the organization.

In summary, contemporary SHRM theory and research is based largely on the RBV (Barney & Wright, 1998; Boxall & Purcell, 2011), the concept of human capital (Barney, 1991; Flamholz & Lacey, 1981), and a neoclassical view of humanity as utility maximizers (Becker, 1964; 1976). This focus on utility maximization applies to the firm as well as individuals (Flamholz & Lacey, 1981). While Penrose's (1959) and Barney's (1991) conceptions of the RBV acknowledge the importance of people in achieving sustainable competitive advantage, the RBV ultimately places organization members on the same level as property, equipment, land, and raw materials: as resources to be used in the achievement of organization objectives. Jackson, et al. (2012) capture this well when they characterize the role of contemporary human resources professionals as "human capital asset experts whose efforts are aimed at creating competitive advantages for the firm" (p. 451).

CHRISTIAN APPROACHES TO BUSINESS AND THE IMPLICATIONS FOR SHRM

Contemporary explorations of faith-informed HRM practice began before the recent theological turn (Dyck & Wiebe, 2012). Hoover (1990), for example, offered an early set of biblically based HRM principles for managing through key HRM-related management questions, while Chewning, Eby, and Roels (1990) addressed several HRM practices in their broader coverage of faith-informed management (see below). More recently, Cafferky (2012) and Dyck and Neubert (2010) have explored HRM practices through a theological lens in their introductory undergraduate management texts. Nyambegera (2005) and Roberts (2015) have expanded this coverage to book-length explorations, with Roberts (2015) using servant leadership as the foundation for his conception of HRM practice. Beyond this discipline-wide coverage, scholars have also examined specific HRM practices in the context of their faith-based management discussions. These practices include compensation (e.g., Alford & Naughton, 2001; Chewning et al., 1990; Naughton, 2005), performance management (e.g., Chewning et al., 1990), learning and human development (e.g., Alford & Naughton, 2001; Chewning et al., 1990), organization design (e.g., Dyck, 2013; Franz, 2014), and job design (e.g., Alford & Naughton, 2001). All of these treatments, however, address HRM as it has been traditionally defined — a staff function — rather than a general management responsibility, or SHRM. The author is not aware of any research within the theological turn that has examined the implications of a Christian faith-based perspective on SHRM. This section seeks to begin that conversation. My examination begins with a review of recent conceptions of Christian faith-based management that I am labeling "common good" (CG) approaches in this article. This review will provide insight into alternative assumptions about humanity and the purpose of business, which will in turn serve as the foundation for a set of propositions constructing a framework for a CG approach to SHRM.

A Biblical View of Humanity and Work

Scholars operating from Protestant and Roman Catholic Christian worldviews have recently offered several faith-based approaches to management and business. Alford and Naughton (2001), Sison and Fontrodona (2012), and Wong and Rae (2011) name their works common good models. Carrascoso (2014) developed a "Catholic stakeholder thinking model." Van Duzer and colleagues (Van Duzer et al., 2007; Van Duzer, 2010) present a "stewardship" model. Dyck (2013) and Franz (2014) specifically set out to examine the management implications of the Christian faith. Dyck (2013) focuses specifically on the Gospel of Luke, while Franz's (2014) examination draws upon a broad review of relevant biblical passages. Taking my lead from Alford and Naughton (2001), Sison and Fontrodona (2012), and Wong and Rae (2011), I'll refer to all seven of these faith-based conceptions collectively as common good (CG) approaches for the purposes of this paper. These CG approaches all contribute to the theological turn by drawing upon the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures to develop a faith-based view of the purpose of business and practice of management in twenty-first century commerce. As my present interest focuses specifically on SHRM, I will limit my discussion of these CG approaches to elements that will inform my study. I begin with a characterization of the CG view of humanity and purpose of business then proceed to an examination and discussion of a CG approach to SHRM.

***Created* imago Dei**. All of our CG approaches to business share a common understanding of humanity being created *imago Dei*, in the image of God. These

discussions generally begin with and focus on the creation story in Genesis chapters one and two, conferring particular characteristics on human beings. Being made *imago Dei* suggests that people have inherent dignity and worth, are inherently relational/social, are inherently creative, and are made to work, thereby imbuing work with inherent value. The following summary of these characteristics draws upon all of our referent approaches (Alford & Naughton, 2001; Carrascoso, 2014; Dyck, 2013; Franz, 2014; Sison & Fontrodona, 2012; Van Duzer et al., 2007; Van Duzer, 2010; Wong & Rae, 2011) and other sources as noted.

Imago Dei (Genesis 1:26-27) suggests that humanity is different from the rest of creation and that people have inherent worth as God's "image bearers" (Genesis 9:6), imbuing humanity with inherent dignity and value before and beyond any instrumental or utilitarian economic purpose. All human persons have value simply as the beloved of God. God directly links the value and dignity of being created in his image to the protection of human life (Genesis 9:6-7) (Franz, 2014) and further extends this value and dignity to the economic arena through the Jubilee regulations (Leviticus 25). Hebrew tribal lands were to be understood as being on loan from the Creator (Genesis 1:12; 2:15), with no members of the community being marginalized based on a lack of wealth creation prowess. Of course, the worth and value of all humans is most dramatically emphasized in Jesus' death on the cross, thereby reconciling humanity and all creation to himself (e.g., John 3:36-17; Romans 5:6-8; Colossians 1:19-23).

Being made *imago Dei* also suggests that humanity is inherently social. A relational understanding of Christian Trinitarian doctrine (e.g., Grenz, 2000; Torrance, 1996; Volf, 1998) views the members of the Godhead as being in constant, intimate communion. This three-in-one relatedness of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is imaged in humanity's "onto-relatedness" (Torrance, 1996) or intrinsic need for relationship with one another. The creation story emphasizes God's relational nature in its use of plural pronouns and adjectives in reference to the Creator (Genesis 1:26; John 1:1-3; Colossians 1:15-17). This same relational nature is then displayed in humanity's creation as male and female (Genesis 1:27; 2:21-24), with a clear statement that humans should not live alone (Genesis 2:18). *Imago Dei* "means being gifted with the capacity to relate meaningfully to God and others" (Marshall, 2001, p. 43).

Being created in God's image further suggests humanity is inherently creative. In Genesis chapter one we are introduced to a creative, working God who freely speaks the universe into existence *ex nihilo*, or from nothing, as a gratuitous act of love (Carrascoso, 2014; Davis, 2007). God's creativity is further recognized in poetry throughout the Hebrew Scriptures (e.g., Psalm 104; Isaiah 45:18; 65:17-19), and in the New Testament (e.g., John 1:3, Colossians 1:15-17). It is in the image of this creative God that humanity is spoken into existence and then charged with partnering with him to steward that creation (Genesis 1:28, 2:15, 9:1). Rather than create *ex nihilo* as does the creator, the created are given charge over the resources of the earth to creatively steward and advance society and culture. Humanity's role is as "priests of creation" or "mediators of order" (Flett, 2005), utilizing the physical and intellectual resources provided by God to develop conceptual and physical tools for the purpose of ordering and orienting life together (Flett, 2005, p. 180).

Finally, being created *imago Dei* suggests that humanity was made for work, and as such, work has inherent value. The working God of Genesis chapters one and two charges humanity as stewards and priests of creation before the fall (Genesis 1:28; 2:15). As such, work is part of God's good, created order. Certainly the purpose and joy of work were marred by the fall, as were the resources created by God for humanity's use in the development of human society (Genesis 3:17-19). But this does not change the inherent goodness and value of work nor humanity's fitness for it. Work is a part of who we are as people created in the image of a working God.

HRM as person and organization development. The view of humanity as *imago Dei* — having inherent value, relationality, and creativity — contrasts with the instrumental neoclassical view of humanity as self-serving utility maximizers. This suggests that an alternative designation to humans as "resources" to be used and managed in service to utilitarian organizational ends be developed. The terms "HRM" and "SHRM" are no longer adequate or appropriate labels for communicating this aspect of the leader's work. Created *imago Dei*, the human person is a social creature and a source of creativity and industry to be nurtured and developed rather than a resource to be managed according to neoclassical assumptions. I therefore propose the terms "person and organization development" (POD) and "strategic person and organization development" (SPOD) as replacements for "human resource management" and "strategic human resource management," respectively. These designations will be used as appropriate through the remainder of this paper.[6]

The Implications of Imago Dei for the Purpose of Business and SPOD

Imago Dei carries important implications for the purpose of business as conceptualized in the CG approaches. A harmonization of these approaches defines the purposes of business in light of *imago Dei* as follows: (a) partner in God's redemptive mission and work by producing goods and/or services that promote human flourishing (*shalom*) inside and outside of the organization, (b) create meaningful work that allows organization members to use their God-given creativity, and (c) create authentic communities of work that include and give voice to the marginalized. These purposes of business are in stark contrast to the narrow shareholder value creation model (e.g., Friedman, 1962/2002; 1970) dominant in contemporary commerce (Cappelli, 2015) (see Table 1). Each of these purposes are discussed below, their biblical and theological origins summarized, and examined for their faith-based SPOD implications.

Promoting human flourishing. Alford and Naughton (2001) draw upon Roman Catholic social teaching (CST), Aristotle, and psychology to present an understanding of business that promotes not only the sustainability of the organization, but all the goods necessary for human development inside and outside the organization. Their CG approach to business is simultaneously personal and social, echoing CST's *imago Dei* view of humanity and its relational Trinitarian perspective (Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, 2004). A "common" good is an end attained in collaborative fashion with its benefits being distributed and shared. A single good may be comprised of multiple ends; these ends are prioritized as foundational (subordinate) and excellent (final) goods. Foundational goods support the pursuit and attainment of excellent goods. Excellent goods are those goods that serve and facilitate human flourishing at the individual and societal levels. Wealth and profit are foundational goods in service to the excellent good of human flourishing, which includes human development at the individual and organizational levels. This framework of prioritized goods is applied to business and management to identify what goods should be pursued by a business and how they should be prioritized. Businesses are to pursue foundational goods (profit, resource efficiency) and excellent goods (human development or flourishing) simultaneously and in the proper relationship to each other so as to

Table 1: Contemporary and Common Good Views of Business and SHRM/SPOD

Concept	Contemporary View	Common Good View
Purpose of business	Maximize shareholder value and wealth.*	Create for-profit workplace communities that produce goods/services to promote human flourishing and provide meaningful/creative work.
Assumptions about people in the organization	Utility maximizers; resources to be used in achievement of organization objectives.	Made imago Dei with inherent dignity and worth beyond value as resources in service to organizational ends.
Purpose of SHRM/SPOD**	Manage human capital assets so as to create competitive advantage (SHRM).	Develop sustainable for-profit workplace communities that promote human flourishing inside and outside the organization (SPOD**).

** It is important to note that while prevalent, stakeholder theory (e.g., Freeman, 1984) offers an important and increasingly embraced alternative purpose for business. Carrascoso (2014) provides a bridge between the stakeholder theory and CG discussions.*

*** SPOD: strategic person and organization development.*

promote human flourishing at the individual, organizational, and societal levels.

Sison and Fontrodona (2012) build on Alford and Naughton's (2001) proposals by digging deeper into Aristotelian-Thomastic tradition. They agree with Alford and Naughton's (2001) foundational and excellent goods framework while reconfiguring it by adding a level between these two goods in a sequential pyramid with foundational goods at the base, excellent goods at the peak, and a new level of "peace and accord" in the center in constant, reciprocal interaction with both foundational and excellent goods. Sison and Fontrodona (2012) draw upon Augustine and Aquinas, respectively, to define peace as "tranquility in order" and concord as the condition when two people "freely agree to something that is good for both" (Sison & Fontrodona, 2012, p. 234). Practices identified as promoting peace and concord, and thus facilitating attainment of profit and resource efficiency (foundational goods) and human flourishing inside and outside the organization (excellent goods), include performance management, compensation, staffing and promotion, and labor relations. Issues of distributive justice and equal opportunity are also concerns of this level. All of these peace and concord policies and practices fall squarely in the realm of contemporary HRM/POD practice.

Van Duzer and colleagues (Van Duzer et al., 2007; Van Duzer, 2010) and Wong and Rae (2011) echo Alford and Naughton (2001) and Sison and Fontrodona's (2012) prioritization of goods and identification of human development — or human flourishing — as central to their CG approach, but do so from an evangelical reformed Protestant perspective drawing upon the biblical concept of *shalom* to define human flourishing. The Hebrew word *shalom*[7] is most often translated into English as "peace," but its meaning goes well beyond the simple absence of violence. *Shalom* captures concepts having to do with totality and completeness, including fulfillment, individual and communal wholeness, community, harmony, tranquility, friendship, security, wellness, and prosperity (Youngblood, 1986). Wolterstorff (2004) describes dwelling in *shalom* as finding delight in living rightly before God, living in right relationship to God's creation, living rightly with the rest of humanity, and living rightly with oneself. Experiencing *shalom* is a simultaneous function of God's good gift (e.g., 1 Chronicles 22:12), living in right relationship with God (e.g., Isaiah 48:22) and doing good (e.g., Psalm 34:14) (Youngblood, 1986).

Van Duzer et al. (Van Duzer et al., 2007; Van Duzer, 2010) go on to consider the implications of *shalom* and *imago Dei* on the role of business as a twenty-first century social institution. They ultimately conclude that business has two intrinsic purposes: (a) create and deliver products and services that contribute to human flourishing, thus honoring *imago Dei* outside the organization and (b) create meaningful work that allows people to use their God-given creativity, honoring *imago Dei* inside the organization. Wong and Rae's "transformational service for the common good" (Wong & Rae, 2011, p. 76) approach adds that *shalom* and the stewardship mandate (Genesis 1:26; 2:15) demand that natural resources be responsibly stewarded; they also emphasize that persons inside and outside the organization be treated with dignity, including those on society's margins. Businesses with these purposes can, with the empowerment of the Holy Spirit, be vehicles for realizing the kingdom of God on earth and bringing *shalom* to relationships broken by sin.[8] This includes broken relationships between persons inside the organization as evidenced by repressive job design and working conditions, unjust or unfair compensation practices, and dangerous workplaces (Van Duzer, 2010). Without identifying them as such, Van Duzer argues that contemporary HRM/POD practices such as job design, health and safety practices, and compensation are central to the intrinsic purposes of business.

In summary, our CG approaches to business identify the promotion of human flourishing as central to the purpose of business. This perspective is based on humanity's creation *imago Dei*, and all of its attendant qualities. These qualities apply to persons inside and outside the organization, having an impact on both products/services produced by the organization and its internal employment practices. This intricate intertwining of external and internal organizational interests suggests that HRM practices are a general management responsibility, and therefore, strategic. This leads to my initial propositions regarding faith-informed SPOD:

- Proposition 1: POD practice is a strategic general management responsibility. POD is intricately linked to the CG intrinsic purposes of business, and is therefore a general management responsibility and inherently strategic.
- Proposition 2: SPOD promotes human flourishing. SPOD simultaneously facilitates organizational profit and resource efficiency while resulting in human flourishing inside and outside the organization.

Creating meaningful work. Carrascoso (2014) reminds us that being created in the image of a creative God, and enabling human flourishing inside the organiza-

tion, calls for work inside the organization to be meaningful and allow for human creativity. He goes on to argue that meaningful and creative work requires organization and job design based on the CST concept of subsidiarity, or the decentralization of decision-making power and authority (Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, 2004). Subsidiarity applied at the organizational-level argues that the role of management is to support and distribute the decision-making responsibility, accountability, and authority to organization members directly responsible for specific tasks (Alford & Naughton, 2001). This decentralization and distribution of power is rooted in *imago Dei*, recognizing each person's creative potential and contributing to the meaningfulness of work (Alford & Naughton, 2001; Carrascoso, 2014).

Dyck (2013), Franz (2014), and Van Duzer (Van Duzer et al., 2007; Van Duzer, 2010) offer perspectives on decentralization similar to subsidiarity through a Protestant lens. Like Alford and Naughton (2001) and Carrascoso (2014), the Protestant arguments are centered on the dignity inherent to humanity's creation *imago Dei*. Rather than centralization, kingdom of God management is characterized by deference among organization members based on treating one another with dignity and respect rooted in *imago Dei* and a preference for servant leadership (e.g., Mark 10:42-45; Luke 12:37; 22:27; John 13:1-17) rooted in stewardship (Wong & Rae, 2011). This deference leads to participation and voice for all community members in regard to organization management and work performance. These characteristics of the CG approach lead to my third proposition:

- Proposition 3: SPOD designs meaningful work. Meaningful work includes job design that allows worker creativity and decision-making (including authority, responsibility, and accountability) at the lowest possible levels in the organization, supporting employee participation and voice. Servant leadership facilitates the design and execution of meaningful work.

Workplace Community. Naughton (2006) draws upon the social component of *imago Dei* to conclude that if we are indeed created in the image of God, then humanity is inherently social and our social structures should honor this aspect of our createdness. The Trinity is a perfect model of the giving and receiving community. This he says, models what social relationships look like when humanity is at its best, including inside the commercial firm. "Our orientation as human beings made in God's image is one of giving ourselves to others whereby we create communities that foster growth in ourselves and others" (Naughton, 2006, p. 44). This giving of oneself includes giving to others inside the workplace community and serving those in the outside community (Naughton, 2006). In addition to giving, communities are characterized by receptivity and "…receiving which fosters a contemplative outlook that… discover[s] in all things the reflection of the Creator and seeing in every person his living image" (John Paul II, 1995, para. 83, in Naughton, 2006, p. 47). This is the Trinitarian pattern — giving and receiving as communion — that should be central in the formation of commercial organizations, or what Alford and Naughton (2001) and Naughton (2006) label "communities of work."

Franz (2014) makes a similar argument for workplace community based on a social/relational view of the Trinity from a reformed Protestant perspective that draws upon Grenz (2000). Franz (2014) suggests that organizational structure informed by both God's personal and communal qualities would be experienced as membership in which members experience common purpose and relationships exhibit Buber's (1958) "I-thou" interactions. These qualities imply community. Community members have voice; dialog is encouraged/facilitated not only to transfer information but to develop interpersonal relationships. This community experience further supports the creation of meaningful work discussed above.

It is important to note here that the social/relational interpretation of the Trinity is the subject of debate among Christian theologians.[9] The concept of workplace community in Christian tradition and theology, however, is not solely dependent upon the social/relational Trinitarian argument. Dyck (2013) and Dyck and Wiebe (2012) argue that community is embedded in Luke and James' understandings of goods and services producing organizations led and comprised by those seeking to follow Jesus' Gospel.

Dyck, Stark and Weimer (2012) help us understand the context of commercial activity in first-century Palestine. The *oikos*, commonly translated as "household" in contemporary English translations of the New Testament, was the primary goods and services producing organization in first-century Palestine. Dyck, et al., point out that the first-century *oikos* or household is not to be confused with twenty-first century nuclear family household that fulfills a primarily consumptive role in contemporary society. The first-century *oikos* was typically multi-generational and could include many different biological families (e.g., husband and wife, their children

and slaves, and the next generation of both). *Oikoi* were the primary employers of their day and were exclusive to the multi-generational ties described above. Being without membership in an *oikos* left one homeless and on the margins of society with little predictable/dependable opportunity for economic survival, except for perhaps occasional day labor for an *oikos* producing cash crops (e.g., olives, grapes). Jesus upset this traditional *oikos* structure by calling his followers to a new form of *oikos* or community, one not bound to traditional *oikos* ties and roles but one in which everybody is welcomed, including the outcast and marginalized (e.g., Luke 14:12-15); all are treated as persons of worth with dignity and respect, including slaves (e.g., Luke 12:35-38) and women (e.g., Luke 1:57-65) (Dyck, 2013). Dyck and Wiebe (2012) identify the early Christian socioeconomic *oikos* of Acts chapter two and the Christian community described in James' epistle as examples of this new type of community.

Dyck (2013) is careful to not conflate commercial activity with the church but challenges twenty-first century readers to consider how Luke's Gospel and Jesus' teaching about first-century *oikos* management apply to twenty-first century commerce. This first-century lens includes acknowledging that what we recognize today as independent social structures/constructs (nuclear family, commercial organizations, community, and later the church) were interwoven in complex ways in first century Palestine. Dyck (2013) concludes that goods and services producing organizations are an important vehicle for enacting, manifesting, and spreading (Acts 20:20) the kingdom of God in contemporary society. This has direct implications for managers and management, including fostering community inside and outside of the organization, creating meaningful work, and building organizational systems and structures that provide members with opportunity and voice (Dyck & Schroeder, 2005).

These Trinitarian and first-century perspectives on the role on community in the CG approach leads us to the following SPOD proposition:

- Proposition 4: SPOD facilitates workplace community. SPOD policies and practice seek to intentionally create and sustain community inside and outside the organization. Community is characterized by a common purpose; reciprocal giving and receiving are the norm.

Organizational systems in the workplace community. Naughton (2006) reminds us that actions of and by the firm are inherently moral and spiritual, not simply instrumental. Organizational policies, practices, and systems, while typically designed to accomplish certain instrumental purposes, contain embedded moral and spiritual elements, impacting the degree to which the organization is able to achieve and sustain community. Wong and Rae (2011), Dyck (2013) and Carrascoso (2014) examine this issue from the perspective of the poor and marginalized. All three conclude that God's redemptive mission in the world is a holistic one that includes physical, spiritual, material, and social dimensions. Of particular importance in this redemptive mission is God's heart for the poor and marginalized in society. Wong and Rae (2011) emphasize this attribute of holistic redemption, linking it to human flourishing and *shalom*. They cite Jesus' concern for the poor and the structure of Hebraic laws designed to reduce economic inequality and protect the poor, widows, and orphans (e.g., Leviticus 25; Deuteronomy 15:1-18) as well as the Hebrew prophets' calls for social and communal justice (e.g., Amos 5:6-15; Micah 6:8-12) to support their argument. Dyck's (2013) study of first-century *oikos* and Jesus' alternative *oikos* draws a similar conclusion, arguing that the kingdom of God is present and extended through the actions (external and internal) of commercial organizations. For Dyck (2013), Luke's message regarding management in the first and twenty-first century is clear: (a) Commercial organizations should be designed to be free of oppressive practices and ensure all members are treated with dignity. (b) Companies should strategically and intentionally seek to include the marginalized in redemptive ways. (c) Goods, services and financial practices should nurture community inside and outside of the organization. Dyck (2013) and Wong and Rae (2011) go on to place special emphasis in their CG approaches on reconciliation in human relationships and justice/voice for the poor and marginalized inside and outside the organization. These perspectives on organizational systems in the CG approach lead us to my fifth SPOD proposition:

- Proposition 5: SPOD systems are inclusive. SPOD systems attend to the needs of the marginalized inside and outside the organization and strive to be free from oppressive practices.

The Role of the Holy Spirit. Dyck (2013), Van Duzer (2010), and Wong and Rae (2011) observe that the Christian business people can only proceed with their creative and redemptive kingdom of God work as they are "enabled by the discernment and power of the Holy Spirit" (Van Duzer, 2010, p. 117). The empowerment of believers in God's new *oikos*, or the church, recorded in Acts is central to the argument (e.g., Acts 1:8). Advancing God's kingdom is not solely dependent

Table 2: Strategic Person and Organization Development (SPOD) Framework Propositions

Proposition	Related CG References
1. POD practice is a strategic general management responsibility. POD is intricately linked to the CG intrinsic purposes of business and is therefore a general management responsibility and inherently strategic.	Sison and Fontrotona (2012); Van Duzer (2010).
2. SPOD promotes human flourishing. SPOD simultaneously facilitates organizational profit and resource efficiency while resulting in human flourishing inside and outside the organization.	Alford and Naughton (2001); Sison and Fontrotona (2012); Van Duzer (2010); Van Duzer, et al. 2007); Wong and Rae (2011).
3. SPOD designs meaningful work. Meaningful work includes job design that allows worker creativity and decision-making (including authority, responsibility and accountability) at the lowest possible levels in the organization, supporting employee participation and voice. Servant leadership facilitates the design and execution of meaningful work.	Alford and Naughton (2001); Carrascoso (2014); Dyck (2013); Franz (2014); Van Duzer (2010); Van Duzer, et al. 2007).
4. SPOD facilitates workplace community. SPOD policies and practice seek to intentionally create and sustain community inside and outside the organization. Community is characterized by common purpose; reciprocal giving and receiving are the norm.	Alford and Naughton (2001); Dyck (2013); Dyck and Wiebe (2012); Franz (2014); Naughton (2006).
5. SPOD systems are inclusive. SPOD systems attend to the needs of the marginalized inside and outside the organization, and strive to be free from oppressive practices.	Carrascoso (2014); Dyck (2013); Wong and Rae (2011).
6. Practicing SPOD requires the guidance and empowerment of the Holy Spirit.	Dyck (2013); Van Duzer (2010); Wong and Rae (2011).

upon human effort and decision-making, nor is it possible. Christian business people should recognize the important role of the Holy Spirit in the development and operation of communities of work committed to advancing the kingdom of God, or the common good, inside and outside the organization (Dyck, 2013). This leads to my final SPOD proposition:

- Proposition 6: Practicing SPOD requires the guidance and empowerment of the Holy Spirit.

See Table 2 for a summary of the six SPOD propositions and related references.

DISCUSSION

Recent critiques of HRM as a discipline recognize the need for executives to understand the values and principles from which they operate in order to be effective. Among these critiques, Cappelli (2015) identifies the dominant principle of maximizing shareholder value as deficient, particularly in regard to the interests of organizational stakeholders beyond shareholders. These critiques implicitly acknowledge Hamel's (2009) call for a broad examination and reconstruction of management theory drawing upon cross-disciplinary sources, including theology. This paper contributes to the theological turn (Dyck

& Wiebe, 2012) in management studies by examining the foundational assumptions of contemporary SHRM and proposing an alternative set of assumptions and principles based on the CG approach to business. My examination of SHRM theory found it to be based on the RBV of the firm (Barney & Wright, 1998; Boxall & Purcell, 2011), the concept of human capital (Barney, 1991; Flamholz & Lacey, 1981), and a neoclassical view of humanity as utility maximizers (Becker, 1964; Becker, 1976). Organization members are viewed as resources to be used in the achievement of organization objectives, just as any other resource (e.g., financial, material). This view of humanity supports contemporary SHRM purpose definitions focused on managing human capital assets to create competitive advantage (e.g., Human Resources Division, Academy of Management, 2014; Jackson et al., 2012).

The CG approach has a very different premise as its foundation: humanity as *imago Dei* and therefore having inherent dignity and worth beyond value as resources in service to organizational ends (Alford & Naughton, 2001; Carrascoso, 2014; Sison & Fontrodona, 2012; Van Duzer et al., 2007; Van Duzer, 2010; Wong & Rae, 2011). I also found the purpose of CG business to be markedly different from Friedman's (1962/2002; 1970) shareholder value creation model. Rather than an exclusive focus on creating shareholder value/wealth, the CG business sets out to develop for-profit workplace communities that produce goods/services to promote human flourishing and create opportunities for meaningful, creative work. This view of humanity and purpose of business provide a foundation for a CG perspective of HRM, or POD. Rather than simply seek to manage human capital for the purpose of creating competitive advantage and shareholder wealth, the purpose of SPOD is to develop sustainable, for-profit workplace communities that promote human flourishing inside and outside of the organization (see Table 1).

Table 3: SPOD Framework Propositions Found in Other Christian Faith-Based HRM Treatments

SPOD Proposition*	Related faith-based HRM Sources
1. POD practice is a strategic general management responsibility.	[Cafferky (2012); Roberts (2015).]**
2. SPOD promotes human flourishing.	[Cafferky (2012); Dyck and Neubert (2010)***.]****
3. SPOD designs meaningful work.	Cafferky (2012); Dyck and Neubert (2010)***.
4. SPOD facilitates workplace community.	Cafferky (2012); Dyck and Neubert (2010)***.
5. SPOD systems are inclusive.	Dyck and Neubert (2010)***; Roberts (2015).
6. Practicing SPOD requires the guidance and empowerment of the Holy Spirit.	Roberts (2015)

** See Table 2 for the complete text of each SPOD proposition.*

*** These scholars do not propose HRM as a general management concern but do make reference to the strategic aspects of HRM. Their treatment of the subject/discipline, however, is largely from a traditional functional perspective.*

**** Dyck and Neubert (2010) is not presented from an explicitly Christian worldview but is compatible with it. The work is included in this list of faith-based HRM treatments based on Dyck, Neubert and Wong's (2008) references to and use of Dyck and Neubert's (2010) multistream model, and the authors' long history of faith integration in their scholarship.*

*****These scholars do not use the term "flourishing" directly, but use or make reference to related concepts such as shalom, peace, happiness, dignity, justice, and community.*

Further examination of the CG approach proposed six elements of an initial SPOD framework (see Table 2). I proposed that HRM is central to the CG approach and that it is inherently strategic in nature, and thus a general management concern. Strategic person and organization development (SPOD) seeks to not simply deliver resource efficiency/effectiveness but promote human flourishing through POD policy and practice. This flourishing includes meaningful work that allows worker creativity, decentralized decision-making and employee voice, and workplace community. Finally, practicing SPOD requires the guidance and empowerment of the Holy Spirit.

This SPOD framework shares some commonality with Cafferky (2012) and Dyck and Neubert's (2010) HRM chapters in their introductory management texts, as well as the HRM-related sections in Alford and Naughton (2001), Carrascoso (2014), Dyck (2013), Van Duzer et al. (Van Duzer et al., 2007; Van Duzer, 2010), Sison and Fontrodona (2012), and Wong and Rae's (2011) CG approaches to business. It also shares some similarity with Nyambegera (2005) and Robert's (2015) book-length treatments of faith-based HRM principles and practices (see Table 3). The SPOD framework proposed herein is unique, however, in that it (a) focuses specifically on SHRM/SPOD as a general management responsibility integrating the firm's people, organization, and competitive advantage interests, as opposed to relegating HRM to a staff function; (b) critically examines the foundational assumptions of contemporary SHRM; (c) develops an alternative, ecumenical, biblically based set of assumptions upon which to base a Christian approach to SPOD; and (d) proposes a set of principles for a Christian approach to SPOD based on those assumptions.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This paper offers six propositions forming a starting point for SPOD scholarship and practice drawn from emerging CG approaches to business and management. The propositions offered make statements about SPOD based on the literature and Scripture reviewed but need further development to be brought to the point of testable hypotheses. Opportunities for future research include (a) developing a theory and model of SPOD that links SPOD practice to individual and organization-level mediators and outcomes, including firm performance and the CG purposes of business, and (b) developing measures related to organizational phenomena embedded in the SPOD propositions, e.g., members' community experience, organizational citizenship behavior, the meaningfulness of work, and inclusion/integration of the marginalized in company operations/outcomes.

SPOD Theory and Model Development

The strategic nature of SPOD implies potential overlap with contemporary SHRM theory and research. Recent SHRM research focusing on bundles of HRM practices, often referred to as high performance work systems (HPWS), has endeavored to examine how SHRM practices as characterized by HPWS influence organizational outcomes. While firm financial performance is the most common outcome measured, operational and other mediators of firm performance are also targets of interest (e.g., Jiang, Lepak, Hu, & Baer, 2012). Social mediators that might be characterized as organizational or workplace community, a central concern of SPOD, are among the potential mediators (e.g., Boyd & Nowell, 2014; Evans & Davis, 2005; Gittell, Seidner, & Wimbush, 2010). Questions to be examined include: How is SPOD realized at the level of policy and practice (are there bundles of POD practices that define SPOD)? What are the specific outcomes of CG businesses? What are the SPOD practices that support/enable these outcomes? And what are the mechanisms/mediators that facilitate this relationship?

Measuring SPOD

Recent scholarship has explored identification and measurement of many organizational phenomena of interest to SPOD, including workplace community (e.g., Love, 2007; Nowell & Boyd, 2014), reciprocal giving and receiving or organizational citizenship behavior (e.g., Lemoine, Parsons, & Kansara, 2015; Li-Yun, Aryee, & Law, 2007; Love & Forret, 2008), and the meaningfulness of work (e.g., Berg, Dutton, & Wrzesniewski, 2013; Lent, 2013; Steger, Dik, & Duffy, 2012). Scholarship related to measuring the inclusion of marginalized groups in company operations and outcomes is slim beyond B Lab's *B impact assessment* (B Lab, 2015). Examination of these and other areas of ex-SPOD organizational scholarship is needed to determine phenomena of common concern and definition to SPOD and SHRM, and phenomena in which SPOD-specific definition and scholarship is needed.

ENDNOTES

[1] While there is no one definitive list of HRM practices, the following topics are among the most common addressed in standard HRM textbooks: organization and job design, workforce planning, recruiting and selection, performance management, compensation and benefits, learning and development, employee relations, health and safety (e.g., Jackson, Schuler, & Werner, 2012; Lepak & Gowan, 2016)

[2] Dyck and Neubert (2010) is not presented from an explicitly Christian worldview but is compatible with it. The work is included in this list of faith-based HRM treatments based on Dyck, Neubert and Wong's (2008) references to and use Dyck and Neubert's (2010) multistream model, and the authors' long history of faith integration in their scholarship.

[3] This paper follows Boxall and Purcell (2011), Hornsby and Kuratko (2005), Lepak and Gowan (2016), and others, identifying HRM as a general management practice. HRM as used in this paper refers not a specific function or department, nor are HRM practice areas limited to such a department. This paper views HRM is a set of people management practices engaged in by managers in all functions and levels of the organization.

[4] HR-related activities and departments during this period would have been referred to as welfare work (benefits) (e.g., U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1919), employment, and shop discipline (e.g., Taylor, 1911).

[5] Penrose's observations regarding the value of what we would label today as learning organizations (e.g., Senge, 1990) were novel, as was her advocacy of economists and social workers collaborating to address global economic development needs (E. T. Penrose, 1947). Further evidence of Penrose's social concern can be found in her personal history as a social worker following graduation from college and her fight against McCarthyism (P. Penrose & Pitelis, 1999).

[6] The "organization development" component of these designations should not be confused with the management discipline of organization development (OD). While the scholarship and practice of POD and SPOD will likely include some of the change management theory practices of traditional OD, these new designations are intended to communicate a fundamentally different assumptions about people and the organizations they create rather than a particular set of contemporary management theories or practices.

[7] The concept of *shalom* is found across the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. The Greek equivalent for the Hebrew term is *eirene*, commonly used to refer to an absence of violence in Greek literature outside the New Testament. New Testament authors, however, assign a much greater depth of meaning to the term, encompassing concepts from *shalom* such as "well-being, completeness, inner satisfaction, the contentment and serenity that derive from having lived a full life, etc. The peace that Jesus gives is qualitatively different from that which the world can give (John 14:27)" (Youngblood, 1986, p. 733).

[8] It is important to note that none of the authors referred to in this paper claim that business is the only or exclusive vehicle for realizing the kingdom of God on earth. They simply argue that business, properly conceived, is an important participant in bringing *shalom*.

[9] See Sexton and Gundry (2014) for a helpful dialog between the classical and relational perspectives.

REFERENCES

Alford, H. J., & Naughton, M. J. (2001). *Managing as if faith mattered: Christian social principles in the modern organization.* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame.

B Lab. (2015). B impact assessment. Retrieved from http://bimpactassessment.net/

Barney, J. B., & Wright, P. M. (1998). On becoming a strategic partner: The role of human resources in gaining competitive advantage. *Human Resource Management, 37*(1), 31-46.

Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management, 17*(1), 99.

Barney, J. B., & Clark, D., N. (2007). *Resource-based theory: Creating and sustaining competitive advantage*. New York, NY: Oxford.

Barney, J. B. (1995). Looking inside for competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Executive, 9*(4), 49-61.

Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Becker, G. S. (1976). *The economic approach to human behavior.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Beer, M., Spector, B., Lawrence, P. R., Mills, D. Q., & Walton, R. E. (1984). *Managing human assets: The groundbreaking Harvard business school program*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Berg, J. M., Dutton, J. E., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2013). Job crafting and meaningful work. In B. J. Dik, Z. S. Byrne & M. F. Steger (Eds.), *Purpose and meaning in the workplace* (pp. 81-104). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Boudreau, J., & Rice, S. (2015). Bright, shiny objects and the future of HR. (cover story). *Harvard Business Review, 93*(7), 72-78.

Boxall, P., & Purcell, J. (2011). *Strategy and human resources management* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Boyd, N. M., & Nowell, B. (2014). Psychological sense of community: A new construct for the field of management. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 23*(2), 107-122.

Buber, M. (1958). *I and thou* (R. G. Smith Trans.). New York, NY: Scribner.

Cafferky, M. E. (2012). *Management: A faith-based perspective*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Cappelli, P. (2015). Why we love to hate HR... and what HR can do about it. (cover story). *Harvard Business Review, 93*(7), 54-61.

Carrascoso, A. C. (2014). A framework for a catholic stakeholder core. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion, 11*(4), 307-330.

Charan, R., Barton, D., & Carey, D. (2015). People before strategy: A new role for the CHRO. (cover story). *Harvard Business Review, 93*(7), 62-71.

Chewning, R. C., Eby, J. W., & Roels, S. J. (1990). *Business through the eyes of faith.* New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Davis, J. J. (2007). Will there be new work in the new creation? *Evangelical Review of Theology, 31*(3), 256-273.

Delbecq, A. L. (2009). Spirituality and business: One scholar's perspective. *Journal of Management, Spirituality and Religion, 6*(1), 3-13.

Devanna, M. A., Fombrun, C., & Tichy, N. M. (1984). A framework for strategic human resources management. In C. Fombrun, N. M. Tichy & M. A. Devanna (Eds.), *Strategic human resources management* (pp. 33-51). New York, NY: Wiley.

Dyck, B. (2013). *Management and the gospel: Luke's radical message for the first and twenty-first centuries*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dyck, B., & Neubert, M. J. (2010). *Management: Current practices and new directions.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Dyck, B., Neubert, M. J., & Wong, K. L. (2008). Unchaining weber's iron cage: A look at what managers can do. *Christian Scholar's Review, 38*(1), 41-60.

Dyck, B., & Schroeder, D. (2005). Management, theology and moral points of view: Towards an alternative to the conventional materialist-individualist ideal-type of management. Journal of Management Studies, 42(4), 705-735.

Dyck, B., Starke, F. A., & Weimer, J. B. (2012). Toward understanding management in first century Palestine. Journal of *Management History, 18*(2), 137-165.

Dyck, B., & Wiebe, E. (2012). Salvation, theology and organizational practices across the centuries. *Organization, 19*(3), 299-324.

Evans, W. R., & Davis, W. D. (2005). High-performance work systems and organizational performance: The mediating role of internal social structure. *Journal of Management, 31*(5), 758-775.

Flamholz, E. G., & Lacey, J. M. (1981). *Personnel management, human capital theory and human resource accounting.* Los Angeles, CA: Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, Los Angeles.

Flett, E. (2005). Priests of creation, mediators of order: The human person as a cultural being in Thomas F. Torrance's theological anthropology. *Scottish Journal of Theology, 58*(2), 161-183.

Fombrun, C. (1984). Environment, strategy and organization. In C. Fombrun, N. M. Tichy & M. A. Devanna (Eds.), *Strategic human resources management* (pp. 1-18). New York, NY: Wiley.

Fombrun, C., Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1984). *Strategic human resources management*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Franz, R. S. (2014). An exercise in theological imagination: Missing constructs and management implications. *Journal of Biblical Integration in Buisness, 17*(1), 43-58.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach.* Boston, MA: Pitman.

Friedman, M. (1962/2002). *Capitalism and freedom.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Friedman, M. (1970, September 13). The social responsibility of buisness is to increase its profits. *New York Times Magazine*, 32-33.

Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad management theories are destroying good management practices. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 4*(1), 75-91.

Gittell, J. H., Seidner, R., & Wimbush, J. (2010). A relational model of how high-performance work systems work. *Organization Science, 21*(2), 490-506.

Grenz, S. (2000). *Theology for the community of God*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Hamel, G. (2009). Moon shots for management. *Harvard Business Review, 87*(2), 91-98.

Hammonds, K. H. (2005). Why we hate HR. *Fast Company*, (97), 40-47.

Hoover, D. J. (1990). Biblical principles applied to human resources. In R. C. Chewning (Ed.), *Biblical principles and business: The practice* (pp. 145-159). Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress.

Hornsby, J. S., & Kuratko, D. F. (2005). *Frontline HR: A handbook for the emerging manager.* Mason, OH: Texere Thompson Higher Education.

Human Resources Division, Academy of Management. (2014). About the division. Retrieved from http://www.hrdiv.org/hr-division/about-the-division/

Jackson, S. E., Schuler, R. S., Lepak, D., & Tarique, I. (2012). HRM practice and scholarship: A North American perspective. In C. Brewster, & W. Mayrhofer (Eds.), *Handbook of research in comparative human resource management* (pp. 451-477). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elger.

Jackson, S. E., Schuler, R. S., & Werner, S. (2012). *Managing human resources* (11th ed.). Mason, OH: Cengage South-Western.

Jiang, K., Lepak, D. P., Hu, J., & Baer, J. C. (2012). How does human resource management influence organizational outcomes? A meta-analytic investigation of mediating mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal, 55*(6), 1264-1294.

Lemoine, G. J., Parsons, C. K., & Kansara, S. (2015). Above and beyond, again and again: Self-regulation in the aftermath of organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(1), 40-55.

Lent, R. W. (2013). Promoting meaning and purpose at work: A social-cognitive perspective. In B. J. Dik, Z. S. Byrne & M. F. Steger (Eds.), (pp. 151-170) American Psychological Association.

Lepak, D. P., & Gowan, M. (2016). *Human resource management: Managing employees for competitive advantage* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: Chicago Business.

Li-Yun, S. U. N., Aryee, S., & Law, K. S. (2007). High-performance human resource practices, citizenship behavior, and organizational performance: A relational perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(3), 558-577.

Love, M. S. (2007). Security in an insecure world: An examination of individualism-collectivism and psychological sense of community at work. *Career Development International, 12*(3), 304-320.

Love, M. S., & Forret, M. (2008). Exchange relationships at work: An examination of the relationship between team-member exchange and supervisor reports of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 14(*4), 342-352.

Marshall, M. (2001). *What it means to be human: Made in the image of God*. Macon, GA: Smyth and Helwys.

McCormick, K. (1997). An essay on the origin of the rational utility. *Eastern Economic Journal, 23*(1), 17.

Naughton, M. J. (2005). A theology of fair pay. *Regent Business Review*, 15(January/February), September 22, 2012-9-14.

Naughton, M. J. (2006). The corporation as a community of work: Understanding the firm within the catholic social tradition. *Ave Maria Law Review, 4*(1), 33-76.

Neal, J. (2013). Faith and spirituality in the workplace: Emerging research and practice. In J. Neal (Ed.), *Handbook of faith and spirituality in the workplace: Emerging research and practice* (pp. 3-18). New York: Springer Science + Business.

Nowell, B., & Boyd, N. M. (2014). Sense of community responsibility in community collaboratives: Advancing a theory of community as resource and responsibility. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 54*(3-4), 229-242.

Nyambegera, S. M. (2005). *Human resources management: A biblical perspective*. Nairobi, Kenya: Uzima.

Penrose, E. T. (1947). Economist and social worker. *Survey Midmonthly, 83*(8), 222-223.

Penrose, E. T. (1959). *The theory of the growth of the firm*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Penrose, P., & Pitelis, C. (1999). Edith elura tilton penrose: Life, contribution and influence. *Contributions to Political Economy, 18*(1), 3-22.

Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace. (2004). *Compendium of the social doctrine of the church*. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.

Porter, M. E. (1979). How competitive forces shape strategy. *Harvard Business Review, 57*(2), 137-145.

Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive strategy: Techniques for analyzing industries and competitors*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Roberts, G. E. (2015). *Christian scripture and human resource management: Building a path to servant leadership through faith*. 2015: Palgrave Macmillan.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Sexton, J. S., & Gundry, S. N. (Eds.). (2014). *Two views on the doctrine of the trinity.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Sison, J. G., & Fontrodona, J. (2012). The common good of the firm in the Aristotelian-Thomistic tradition. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 22*(2), 211-246.

Steger, M. F., Dik, B. J., & Duffy, R. D. (2012). Measuring meaningful work: The work and meaning inventory (WAMI). *Journal of Career Assessment, 20*(3), 322-337.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *Shop management*. New York, NY: Harper and Brothers.

Tichy, N. M., Fombrun, C., & Devanna, M. A. (1984). The organizational context of strategic human resources management. In C. Fombrun, N. M. Tichy & M. A. Devanna (Eds.), *Strategic human resources management* (pp. 19-31). New York, NY: Wiley.

Torrance, T. F. (1996). *The Christian doctrine of God, one being three persons.* London, UK: T & T Clark.

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. (1919). Welfare work for employees in industrial establishments in the United States. *Bulletin*, (250 (February))

Van Duzer, J. (2010). *Why business matters to God (and what still needs to be fixed)*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.

Van Duzer, J., Franz, R. S., Karns, G. L., Wong, K. L., & Daniels, D. (2007). It's not your business: A Christian reflection on stewardship and business. *Journal of Management, Spirituality and Religion, 4*(1), 99-122.

Volf, M. (1998). 'The trinity is our social program': The doctrine of the trinity and the shape of social engagement. *Modern Theology, 14*(3), 403-423.

Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal, 5*(2), 171-180.

Wicks, A. (2014). Stakeholder theory and spirituality. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion, 11*(4), 294-306. doi:10.1080/14766086.2014.917984

Wolterstorff, N. (2004). In Joldersma C. W., Stronks G. G. (Eds.), *Educating for shalom: Essays on Christian higher education*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Wong, K. L., & Rae, S. B. (2011). *Business for the common good: A Christian vision for the marketplace*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.

Wright, P. M., McMahan, G. C., & McWilliams, A. (1994). Human resources and sustained competitive advantage: A resource-based perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 5*(2), 301-326.

Youngblood, R. F. (1986). Peace. In G. W. Bromiley, E. F. Harrison, R. K. Harrison, W. S. LaSor, L. T. Geraty & E. W. Smith Jr. (Eds.), *The international standard bible encyclopedia, volume 3: K-P* (4th ed., pp. 731-733). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Richard Harvey Jonsen is a PhD candidate (ABD) at the College of Business and Leadership, Eastern University, where he also serves as a senior lecturer. His research interests include workplace community, high involvement work systems, and other-constituency views of the firm. Rick transitioned to the academe following a 19 year career as a human resources professional in the consumer electronics, medical device and pharmaceuticals industries.

The author would like to thank the present and past JBIB editors, three anonymous reviewers, fellow doctoral students, and faculty of Eastern University for their thoughtful criticism and helpful support in the development of this article over the past several years. Of course, any errors in fact or interpretation remain those of the author.